

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Claims have been rejected as being anticipated by several references considered individually: (1) Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Rubber Toughened and Optically Transparent Blends of Cyclic Olefin Copolymers* to Khanarian (hereinafter referred to as "Khanarian"); (2) Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,854,349 to Abe et al.; (3) Claims 1-7 and 10-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0995776 to Miyamoto et al.; (4) Claims 1-7 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,918,133 to Moriya et al.; and (5) Claims 1, 3-7, and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0128392 to Zen et al.

To further clarify the claimed invention, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the cycloolefinic polymer and the elastomeric copolymer exhibit a difference in refractive index of 0.03 or greater. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 10, lines 1 – 2. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest a polymer composition comprising a cyclic olefin component and an elastomeric copolymer component having the recited optical properties wherein the components exhibit a difference of refractive index that is 0.03 or greater. In fact, Khanarian, Abe, Miyamoto all specifically teach that to have improved optical properties (e.g., haze values) the elastomeric component and the cyclic olefin component need to be refractive indexed matched. For example, Miyamoto and Abe teach that the difference between refractive index for the components is at most 0.015.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required

Appl. No.: 10/766,753
Amdt. dated 10/18/2006
Reply to Office action of 07/18/2006

therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit
Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy J. Balts
Registration No. 51,429

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30164648v1

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT &
TRADEMARK OFFICE ON November 20, 2006.**